



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—ALBIUS AND TIBULLUS.

The fittest acknowledgment that I can make for the complimentary epithets 'very clever' and 'very plausible' bestowed by Mr. B. L. Ullman (A. J. P. XXXIII 149 sq.) on the discussion in my Selections from Tibullus, Appendix A, of the question, 'Was Tibullus the *Albius* of Horace'? will be to show that they may have more justification in its substance than readers of Mr. Ullman's paper would be apt to infer. I will not attempt to traverse the whole ground again. I will confine myself to considering certain points which are vital ones to his own solution of the problem.

If our investigation is to escape the 'flaws' so prevalent 'in classical research' at the present day, especially where a matter of literary criticism or history is in dispute, it is necessary that every portion of the evidence should be examined by itself, without prepossession and without reference to any deductions, that may be made from any other piece of evidence not at the moment before us. If this is done, and only if it be done, can we have any security that our final combination is the real resultant of its components. Does Mr. Ullman's treatment of the crucial passage Hor. Carm. I. 33. 1-4 conform to this condition? Let us see.

I quote the whole of the ode for a reason that will presently appear :

Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor
immitis *Glyceræ*, neu miserabilis
decantes elegos cur tibi iunior
 laesa præniteat fide.
insignem tenui fronte *Lycorida*
Cyri torret amor, Cyrus in asperam
declinat *Pholoen*: sed prius Apulis
 iungentur capreae lupis
quam turpi Pholoe peccet adultero.
sic uisum Veneri cui placet imparis
formas atque animos sub iuga aenea
 saeuo mittere cum ioco.
ipsum me melior cum peteret Venus,
grata detinuit compede *Myrtale*
libertina, fretis acrior Hadriae
 curuantis Calabros sinus.

The interpretation of the words must engage us first; and here Mr. Ullman has a novelty. Believing that by the *Glycera* of Albius is meant the *Nemesis* of Tibullus, he would smooth the way to the identification by treating the proper name as a common one. He says:

It was one of the most common names of *hetaerae*, and Horace might just as well have used the common noun *meretrix*, except that it would be less refined and romantic. Horace himself uses the name a number of times for no particular individual but for the class. *Glycera* is, therefore, hardly a proper noun at all. Its use corresponds to that of *Gaia*, commonly used as a synonym for *mulier*.¹ Similar instances are common in all languages; cf. Jezebel (in. French *Mégère*), Jehu, etc.

It is here said that Horace uses the name 'a number of times for no particular individual, but for the class'. This is throwing dust in the eyes of the reader who has no *index nominum* to his Horace. Apart from the present passage the word occurs *thrice* in the poems. C. I. 19. 5 'urit *me Glycerae* nitor | splendentis Pario marmore purius' and III 19. 28 '*me* lentus *Glycerae* torret amor *meae*' may be taken together. Does Mr. Ullman really hope to convince anyone that *Glycera* is a mere substitute for *meretrix* here, or in I. 30. 3 'O Venus, regina Cnidi Paphique, | sperne dilectam Cypron et uocantis | ture te multo *Glycerae* decoram | transfer in aedem?' If a real person is here referred to, why should *Glycera* not have been her real name? and if but a figure of shadow, why should not the phantom have received a proper name from its maker? If some one says, 'Oh, then, the *Glycera* of these passages is different from the *Glycera* of Albius', what objection can Mr. Ullman raise? Has he not already said 'it was one of the *most common names of hetaerae*?' But even if Mr. Ullman had shown that *Glycera* was a synonym for *meretrix*, this would be of no use to him here. The topic of

¹ What are we to make of this? Has Mr. Ullman forgotten the ridicule which the unfortunate *iuris periti* incurred from Cicero for a far less sweeping assertion? 'in omni denique iure ciuili aequitatem reliquerunt, uerba ipsa tenuerunt ut, quia in alicuius libris exempli causa id nomen inueniant, putarent omnes mulieres, quae coemptionem facerent, Gaias uocari' Muræna § 27. To take a familiar example, would he contend that because John Doe and Richard Roe are frequently put for names of persons in legal language an English writer would refer to the laments of the *immitis Shylock* as the lamentations of the 'ruthless *Roe*' and expect to be understood? His modern parallels do not help him, as he has left out of sight the obvious consideration that Latin has no means of distinguishing between 'Jehu' and 'a jehu' or 'the jehu'.

consolation addressed to the subject of this ode is that the course of love is never smooth. And for this purpose *particular* instances are cited, and cited by name. As Lycoris finds Cyrus, as Cyrus finds Pholoe, as Horace finds Myrtale, so does Albius find Glycera. If Cyrus, Pholoe and Myrtale are names of persons then Glycera also should be the name of a person. If Glycera is a synonym of *meretrix*, then Pholoe and Myrtale should be synonyms of *meretrix* too.

The ground thus cleared of Mr. Ullman's unauthorized intruder, the common name "Glycera", we can ask what Horace intends us to understand by what he says in this ode. His words are plain; and when set out yield the following results: A certain friend of his (1) Albius by name, has been (2) writing piteous elegies because (3) his mistress 'Glycera' has (4) cast him off for a younger rival. Now apart from (1) the matter at issue, there are three statements here and Mr. Ullman rejects two of them. He says, contradicting Horace, that the mistress of Horace's Albius was not Glycera, and he says, again contradicting Horace, that his rival was a richer (not a younger) man. But he fails to see where this method should carry him. If we disbelieve that this elegiac writer's mistress was Glycera, why should we believe that his own name was Albius? And why should Horace not have been as 'inexact' in reporting his metre as he has been in describing his rival? In our haste to show that Tibullus was the Albius of Horace, we have destroyed the credit of the witness on whose testimony we wish to rely. And after all, what is gained by the proceeding? Suppose for the moment that Tibullus *was* called Albius. There is only one way of proving that he is referred to in the ode. And that is for some person with the proper credentials to come forward and say 'I have acquainted myself with the whole of the facts as they were known to the poet's contemporaries, and I can aver with certainty that the *only* 'Albius' who wrote 'elegies' at that time was 'Albius Tibullus', and consequently that his friend and co-eval Horace has grievously misstated matters upon which he professed to be informed'.

There are unfortunately other scholars who identify Glycera and Nemesis. So, to put the matter in a nutshell, I would challenge them, all and singly, to produce a single instance from ancient or modern literature in which the inamorata of any writer has in any published writing, and without an accompanying ex-

planation, been assigned any other name than that by which she was known to the public. When they have done so, they will have put themselves within the pale of argument.

It is possible to maintain, though Mr. Ullman does not maintain it, that, though the Albius of the ode is not Tibullus, the Albius of the Epistle (I. 4) may be. I have argued against this identification, *op. cit.* p. 182, and I have nothing to add here.¹ I am sorry to note that Mr. Ullman cannot see that there *is* a difference, and a considerable difference, between comparing the work of the chief elegiac poet of Rome whom his contemporary Marsus associated with Vergil to that of a Cassius Parmensis and doing the same for that of a 'rich literary amateur.' Even in jests proportion and τὸ πρέπον must be observed.

Mr. Ullman fills some five pages with an attempt to show that the description of Albius in the Epistle *is* appropriate to Tibullus. His interpretation appears to me fantastical. But I do not care to pursue it in detail. I will however give reasons for my judgment, so far as it concerns his exegesis of a single line: 'an *tacitum* siluas inter *reptare salubris*.' Mr. Ullman says that 'verse 4 shows what is the matter with Tibullus: *tacitum* shows that he is brooding, melancholy; *reptare* suggests the dragging steps of a dejected individual; *salubris* . . . suggests that Tibullus was looking for . . . mental health'. But *tacitum* does not mean 'brooding, melancholy,' but simply 'not inclined to talk', 'in mood for meditation, pensive, musing,' as it does at S. I. 3. 63. sq. 'simplicior quis et est qualem me saepe libenter | obtulerim tibi, Maecenas, ut forte *legentem* | aut *tacitum* impellat quouis sermone' and so in the other place where Horace uses it, *ib.* 6. 123. Nor is there any more 'dejection' about *reptare* here than in Pliny Ep. 1. 24. 4 'scholasticis porro dominis, ut hic est, sufficit abunde tantum soli ut releuare caput, reficere oculos, *reptare* per limitem unamque semitam terere omnisque uiteculas suas nosse et numerare arbusculas possint', where it depicts the leisurely movement of a scholar who saunters or, if you like, potters about his little country estate. And it is perverse to limit *salubris* to the sense of giving 'mental health'. Though Albius might have 'ualetudo abunde', there was no need for him to risk it by strolling in insalubrious woods.

¹It may be noted that both identifications are in Porphyrio's commentary.

To come to the next point, the actual evidence that our poet's name was Albius. It is of course possible to hold that it was, without holding that its owner was the Albius of Horace's Ode and Epistle. And those who do this will ask what testimony, independent of that identification, can be discovered. They will find the statement that he was thus called in three existing sources—Diomedes, Porphyrio and the anonymous *Vita Tibulli*. But they will also find that in the two first it is *coupled with the identification*, and that therefore, in our ignorance of the sources which these writers actually employed, we are not entitled to take for granted that it is independent of that identification. Whether Porphyrio, the elder of the two (though he cannot have lived earlier than the second century A. D.), made it himself, or derived it from others, we cannot tell, though it is at least a plausible conjecture that he got it from one of the literary busybodies 'who wrote on the characters of Horace' (Porph. on Sat. 1. 3. 21 and 91). The *Life* is left. As regards this Mr. Ullman says that I admit 'for the sake of the argument' that 'Suetonius is the ultimate source of this life' and he complains that 'this surprising generosity rather takes one off one's guard', p. 150. I will therefore take the opportunity of stating anew the impression which this document left and leaves upon my mind. It is that of a patchwork, with some bits older than others. Some bits look as if they were Suetonian in origin, and this they may be, although I cannot, even 'to shorten the discussion', admit that they *must*. Others again seem to belong to a much less classical period. In the first words of it 'Albius Tibullus', with which alone we are now concerned, there is nothing to indicate their source. Anyone who could decline a Latin noun might have written them. My 'generosity' then amounted to granting that the statement they contain *may* have come from Suetonius; but may equally well have come from some other, later or inferior, source. It was therefore 'necessary to examine the life itself before pronouncing on its credibility'. And I examined its contents with the result set out by Mr. Ullman (though he ought not to say that I attributed the identification of Albius with Tibullus to Suetonius). The analysis showed, and as far as I know Mr. Ullman does not dispute this, that the *Vita* contains nothing about Tibullus that its compiler might not have got from the use of sources which we have as well as he. It is quite useless to argue against this that *in other cases* we know that Suetonius had 'a

considerable amount of material which is not accessible to us'. What we are concerned with is Tibullus and Tibullus alone.¹

Mr. Ullman's argument raises the questions of the trustworthiness of Suetonius and his critical competence. If his reputation for either stood higher than it does, I might be tempted to examine it further. As it is, I will ask Mr. Ullman some questions about a passage in another literary life, believed to have come from the same pen, that should cause him some serious reflection either on the credibility of biographers or on the sources and composition of 'Lives'.

The following sentence is from *Suetoni Vita Horati a Porphyryione commentario praemissa* (Vollmer Hor. p. 7):

Ad res uenereas intemperantior traditur, nam specula toto cubiculo dicitur habuisse disposita ita ut quocumque respexisset sibi imago coitus referretur.

I will ask Mr. Ullman to compare this statement about Q. Horatius Flaccus with the account given by Seneca N. Q. I. 16 of a certain Hostius Quadra, whose character was of such a kind that, when he was murdered by his slaves, Horace's intimate friend and patron Augustus declined to punish them; and then to say 1. whether he accepts the statement; 2. whether he believes that Suetonius wrote it; 3. whether he is now quite comfortable in his mind as to the value of 'Suetonian' or other identifications.

J. P. POSTGATE.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, August, 1912.

¹ May I here explain why I have omitted 'Albius' from the title page of the editions of the whole or parts of the poet's works that I have published, so causing concern to some whom I am sorry to disquiet? I do not claim that I have shown that he was not called Albius: that is a negative which from the nature of the case it is impossible to prove. But, in view of the 'weighty reasons for doubting this statement' (Tibullus Selections, p. xviii), I felt that prudence demanded that he should be given only that name which was certainly his, lest the 'Albius' of current appellation and traditional biography should prove to have no better warrant than the 'Aurelius' which, itself the figment of an identification, disfigured, even in the edition of Lachmann, the title page of our poet's contemporary Propertius.